



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

States are, Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas, Minnesota and Missouri. The Connecticut commission on the consolidation of state commissions and the reorganization of the public health laws, reported back to the same session and secured the passage of an act establishing a state department of labor and factory inspection. The others report to the next session.

Eight States provided machinery for collecting budget estimates. In five of these the estimates are to be assembled by existing officials. In Minnesota and Nebraska by the governor, in Nevada by the state board of examiners, in Washington by the state board of finance, and in West Virginia by the chief inspector of public offices. The North Dakota budget board and the Vermont committee on budget are organized on the same plan as the Wisconsin board of public affairs, the chairman of the finance committees, one or two other legislators and three or four of the chief financial officers of the State. The Connecticut state board of finance consists of three members appointed by the governor, with the treasurer, comptroller and tax commissioner, *ex officio*. This board not only collects the estimates, it is directed to sit with and become a part of the joint finance committee during the session. The appointed members serve for six years with overlapping terms. This experiment of Connecticut appears to fit in with the scheme of government in an American State with less disturbance than most of the schemes that have been suggested for collecting and formulating a state budget.

C. C. WATERS.

Providence, R. I.

Recent Tendencies in Charter-Making. During the last half-year the number of cities which have exchanged their worn charters for new has been relatively small. Does this municipal tranquillity mean that less emphasis will henceforth be laid upon the type of charter and more upon the need for an enlightened electorate which will not forget the responsibility of office-holders to it? Or is it merely that we are within sight of the decline of an abnormal enthusiasm for charter revision? The latter might be the expected consequence from the rush towards commission government, were it not that few cities which have tried that form have changed back to the mayor and council type, although attempts in several municipalities have been made without success. Two cities in Massachusetts, however, have abandoned commission government, but in both cases the plan had been

adopted to meet some peculiar need. In Salem commission government, with its recall proviso, was originally selected in the hope of taking municipal affairs out of the hands of an undesirable but tenacious administration. The scheme having served its purpose, Plan B of the Massachusetts optional charter law was adopted in November. In the case of Chelsea the commission form of government was arranged for, after the city's devastating fire in 1907, through the appointment by the governor of the State of five commissioners for a period of six years. At the expiration of that time the city resumed its normal government.

Two cities which have recently tried, and failed, to give up commission government are Biddeford, Me., and Jacksonville, Ill. In both it was proposed to return to the aldermanic form of administration and in both the movement was defeated by substantial majorities.

Commission government pure and simple has gained a few converts during the last half-year and, in combination with the city-manager plan, has thriven well. About as many cities have rejected the commission form, however, as have adopted it, and such action has not been confined to any particular section of the country. The plan has been lately accepted in Bridgeport, Conn., Cape May, N. J., St. Marys, Kans., Alpena, Mich., and Springfield, Mo.; it was defeated in Bangor, Me., Frankfort, Ky., Lenoir City, Tenn., Chippewa, Wis., Knoxville, Ia., and Billings, Mont. On the other hand, the following cities have adopted the city-manager plan of government: Watertown, N. Y. (Plan C of the optional charter law), Portsmouth, Va., Elizabeth, N. C., Albion, Mich., Webster City, Ia., San Antonio, Tex., and Santa Barbara and San José, Cal.

Although the number of new charters, other than the above-mentioned, has been small, yet there are a good many points of interest to be found—in the adopted charters, in the proposed charters, and in the rejections. In several large cities charter commissions have been at work for some time, with results varying in their stages of completion. The draft of a charter for Newark, N. J., has been finished and awaits approval by the legislature. It provides for six elective officers only, with four year terms, that is, a mayor and council of five, of which the president is selected as such. Voting is by preferential ballot. The salary of the mayor is \$10,000, of the councilmen \$3500 each, with \$4000 for the president. Wide executive powers are given to the mayor—he appoints and removes the directors of departments and is responsible for the conduct of their departments.

He is a member of the sinking fund commission and in the board of estimate he is entitled to three votes. This latter board, composed of the mayor, the director of finance and president of the council (with two votes each), and the other four councilors (with one vote each), prepares the budget and determines upon the amount to be raised by taxation. To the council belong all other legislative functions, including those formerly looked after by the various municipal boards, and the duties of an excise board. A city purchasing agent is also provided. In a word, the council's legislation (subject to veto by the mayor and repassing by that body) is to be carried out by the mayor's appointees, whom he may remove at any time.

In the city of Los Angeles a new charter, drafted by a board of freeholders, will be submitted to the voters in June, 1916. Here, where the city had overwhelmingly outgrown the provisions made twenty-five years ago, the chief emphasis has been laid upon unity and efficiency. To this end the functions of government, which have been diffused into forty individual branches, are to be administered by twelve departments, with uniform provisions applying to each. The number of commissions has been reduced by ten. The "business" departments of the city are in charge, each, of a single director who is appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the council. Each of the "humanitarian" departments, on the other hand, is placed under a commission of five citizens who receive no compensation. Elective officials include the mayor, a council of nine, the city controller, the city attorney, the city prosecutor, the judges of the municipal courts, and a board of education composed of seven members, all with four-year terms and subject to recall. In addition, there are three boards: an advisory board composed of the mayor, directors of all departments, and presidents of all commissions; a committee of estimates made up of the mayor, controller, and president of the council, which prepares the budget subject to the approval of the mayor and council; and an excise board of five which is composed entirely of the mayor's appointees. The mayor also appoints, under civil service rules, an efficiency chief and the city clerk. Provision is made here, also, for a central purchasing agency. Salaries have been moderately increased in the charter-draft, that of the mayor to \$7500, controller and attorney \$5000 each, prosecutor \$4000, and council members \$3000 each. Special attention has been paid to removing all obstacles to the consolidation of city with county offices. With the charter will be submitted four alternative propositions for sepa-

rate voting. These provide for: (1) the creation of a business manager of departments; (2) a two-year term for elective officers, instead of four; (3) district representation in the council; and (4) election of the council under arrangements for proportional representation.

In this latter connection it might be mentioned that at its recent election the city of Ashtabula, Ohio, used the Hare system of proportional representation for the election of its city council. This is said to be the first application of the scheme in American municipal elections. In Ashtabula seven councilmen were chosen by use of first, second, third and other choice votes, involving the elimination of low candidates on successive counts. By this means it is claimed that representation is given to any faction in the city which can muster one-seventh of the voting strength. The election resulted in the choice of five Republicans, one Democrat, and one Socialist, who represented, racially, one Italian, one Swede, and five natural-born Americans, and, in nature of religion, two Catholics and five Protestants. The choice of a city manager is in the hands of the council.

Another California city which proposed to amend its charter was Oakland, where for four years the council-commission plan, with five commissioners, had administered the city departments. In response to a feeling of dissatisfaction with the lack of central control and single responsibility, fifteen amendments were drafted by the Tax Association of Alameda County intended to simplify the form of government, to promote business efficiency by providing expert administrative service under the control of a city manager immediately responsible to the council, and to insure through its budget provisions complete publicity for all financial transactions. It is endeavored to make a sharp distinction between the legislative and the administrative: the former is elective, unsalaried, subject to recall, and determines *policies* only; the latter is appointed, on grounds of expertness and fitness, and conducts the *business* of the city. The amendments provide for an unsalaried council of six members and a mayor, to perform legislative functions, the mayor to act simply as ceremonial head and presiding officer of the city. Executive powers are in the hands of a city manager, appointed and directed by the city council. His qualifications seem to be desired along the line of a successful administrator and director, rather than an engineer. Next to the city-manager scheme, the most important amendment concerns budget-making. The city manager prepares the budget and the council adopts it. In order to insure full publicity of all financial matters,

the budget must be printed in pamphlet form for distribution to taxpayers before it is discussed by the council. The school committee is appointed by the mayor instead of elected, as formerly, and its business affairs may be placed in charge of the city manager if so desired. Civil service rules are more rigid and are made to apply to all positions save the city manager and his secretary, and the city attorney and his assistants.

It is interesting to note that two new municipalities in States which have provided optional charter laws, White Plains, N. Y., and Leominster, Mass., have adopted charters which do not correspond exactly to any of the types recommended by the State for adoption. In White Plains a mayor and a board of six councilors are elected at large; the mayor to receive a salary of \$1000 and the councilmen \$300 each. These elective officers serve as a board of directors for the city and appoint three commissioners—of public works, finance, and public safety—who hold office at the will of the council and select their own subordinates. The Leominster city charter provides for the election, for two years, of a mayor and council of nine, elected, one from each of the five wards, and four at large. Appointment of all heads of departments and members of boards, with the exception of the school committee, the city clerk, and the city solicitor, is in the hands of the mayor, subject to confirmation by the council. The mayor may also remove such persons, with the approval of a majority of the council. The school committee is composed of the mayor and six elected members; the city clerk is appointed by the council, and the city solicitor by the mayor without confirmation. The administrative departments of the city are fourteen in number. Party designations at elections and party primaries are abolished. Provision is made for the initiative and referendum; the percentage of required signatures for petitions being the same as that stipulated in the optional law. No mention is made of a veto power for the mayor, although he may attend council meetings and express his opinions. This charter differs from Plan B of the optional charter law mainly in the smaller charter and in the lack of veto power allowed the mayor.

Two cities in Massachusetts, Cambridge and Salem (as beforementioned) voted in November to substitute Plan B for their existing charters. Plan B, briefly, is known as the "divided authority" type and provides for a mayor and city council of not more than fifteen members, one elected from each ward and the remainder at large.

To the mayor is given power of appointment, removal, and veto, subject to the approval of the city council. The plan was defeated for adoption at the November election in Taunton.

Another city which is working upon charter revision is Hartford, Conn. The project here presents the novel feature of committee administration for the departments of fire, police, streets, health and charities, parks and water—the committees in each case to be composed of two members of the board of aldermen and one person appointed by the mayor. Other administrative officers are appointed, for a period of three years, by the mayor also, with the advice and consent of the aldermen. The latter boards consists of twelve members, who, with the mayor, are elected for three-year terms. Nomination for office is by petition and party designations are abolished. Any appointive official may be removed for cause by the mayor with the advice and consent of the any four aldermen. A purchasing agent is also provided.

The Chamber of Commerce of Norfolk, Va., has taken action toward charter revision, and its charter commission has reported the result of a year's investigation for a simplified businesslike form of government. It is the opinion of this body that commission government represents a distinct advance over the old type of city government, and yet is lacking in administrative unity and harmony because of the division in executive power and in expertness in the heads of departments. The city-manager plan is consequently recommended as possessing all the good points of the commission form and removing its defects by carrying out the principle of "election for policy and appointment for efficiency." Furthermore, the chamber's commission doubts the usefulness of civil service as applied to the concentration of power and responsibility in the hands of a city manager, and does not favor its extension beyond the fire and police departments. In Richmond, Va., also a new charter is being drawn up and the draft will be presented for some action before long. In this connection it is worth noticing that the part played by chambers of commerce in instigating and procuring charter revisions is steadily increasing. This has been particularly true in the case of city-manager-plan charters, and, in point of fact, most if not all of the earliest adoptions of this scheme were directly proposed by chambers of commerce.

While the city-manager plan is still in the experimental state, it

is steadily gaining new adherents from those who are content to trust to a principle excellent in theory even though as yet too briefly tried for sure determination of results. Nevertheless a few statistics relating to its adoption may be of interest. Thus far about forty cities have adopted the scheme either through a special charter or by means of an optional state law, while a few over twenty others have made special provisions by ordinance for a city manager. About ten of these cities, however, have not yet put the plan into actual operation. Optional state laws which contain this type of charter have been passed in four States—Ohio, Virginia, Iowa, and Massachusetts. Of these sixty-odd city-manager cities only two, Dayton, Ohio, and San Antonio, Tex., have more than 100,000 population, and three others, Springfield, Ohio, Wheeling, W. Va., and San Diego, Cal., have more than 40,000; while in nearly forty the population is less than 10,000. Twenty-three states are represented in the list, from all sections of the country; the four States which have the largest showing are Michigan with eight cities, Texas seven, California six, and Ohio five. Only one New England State appears in the list—Massachusetts, where the town of Norwood has a business manager by a special provision; New York State has three cities and Pennsylvania one; there are no other strictly eastern states. The plan has found a good deal of favor in the south. In general the concrete advantages which the régime of a city manager brings to a municipality seem to be along the line of better administration of city finances. This is shown in their systems of accounting and purchasing, and in their budgets. It is a feature of most city-manager charters to intrust to the city manager the formulation of the budget estimates. In Dayton an up-to-date form of segregated budget has been adopted, and the city of Jackson, Mich., also shows improvement in this respect. The management of public works departments is another bright spot in city-manager administration, due largely to the fact that in most cities the city manager is an engineer by profession. All things considered, thus far most of the cities which have this form of administration, have not shown very striking improvements; the cities of Springfield and Jackson, however, have made considerable headway; and Dayton has achieved first-class progress.

ALICE M. HOLDEN.

*Bureau of Research in Municipal Government,
Harvard University.*